

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 27, 2005, having a shortened statutory period set to expire April 27, 2005. Proposed amendments are submitted for Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-9, 11 and 13. Claims 1-14 are currently pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Safai* (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,336 – "*Safai*").

Safai teaches attaching to a digital image in a camera "information useful in authenticating the source of the captured image" (*Safai*, col. 2, lines 33-35). A secure key specific for a particular camera is stored within the camera to encrypt/decrypt a digital authentication stamp that is appended to the digital image (*Safai*, col. 14, lines 45-47 and 65-67).

With reference to exemplary Claim 1, *Safai* does not teach or suggest a digital signature data "being utilized only within said camera by only said camera" (emphasis added). Authentication only within the camera affords a new and useful level of security, while minimizing the memory requirement of the camera. A shortened "hash" of the picture is permanently stored in the camera, and a hash of a picture to be authenticated is then loaded into the camera, where it is compared with the permanently stored hash.

The feature in Claim 1 of "said digital signature data being stored separately from said image in said camera" is taught away from by *Safai*, which teaches appending the digital authentication stamp to the digital image (*Safai*, col. 14, lines 45-47).

The feature in Claim 1 of "wherein said signature is inaccessible to devices other than said camera" is not taught or suggested by *Safai*. *Safai* teaches on col. 14, lines 65-67, the

storing of a key in the camera, but not the signature such that the signature is inaccessible to devices other than the camera in which it is stored.

TELECONFERENCE

Applicants note with appreciation the teleconference granted on March 23, 2005, held with Examiner Long and Primary Examiner Vu. The Examiners indicated that they felt that the term "digital signature" was vague, and could be interpreted as a hardware device. While Applicants feel that the generally accepted definition of the term "digital signature" is not vague, in an effort to advance the prosecution of the present case, Applicants have amended the term to the Examiner's suggestion of "digital signature data."

CONCLUSION

Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 50-0563.**

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)